arXiv:1702.08572v1 [stat.ME] 27 Feb 2017

Comparison of Confidence Interval Estimators: an Index Approach

Richard Minkah*
and
Tertius de Wet

March 1, 2017

Abstract

We develop a confidence interval index for comparing confidence interval estimators based on the confidence interval length and coverage probability. We show that the confidence interval index has range of values within the neighborhood of the range of the coverage probability, [0,1]. In addition, a good confidence interval estimator is shown to have an index value approaching 1; and a bad confidence interval has an index value approaching 0. A simulation study is conducted to assess the finite sample performance of the index. Finally, the proposed index is illustrated with a practical example from the literature.

Keywords: confidence interval length; coverage probability; bootstrap calibration.

*Richard Minkah, Department of Statistics, College of Basic and Applied Sciences, University of Ghana, Ghana (E-Mail: rminkah@ug.edu.gh); Tertius de Wet, Department of Statistics and Actuarial Science, Stellenbosch University, Stellenbosch, South Africa (E-mail: tdewet@sun.ac.za). This research was supported by a grant from the University of Ghana - Carnegie Corporation Next Generation of African Academics.

1 INTRODUCTION

Most statistical problems involve the estimation of some unknown parameter, θ, of a population from an observed sample using an estimator, $\hat{\theta}$. In order to provide a complete description of the information in the sample about θ, a confidence interval is usually constructed. The key concepts associated with confidence intervals are the coverage probability and interval length. The former is the proportion of times the confidence interval encloses θ under many replications; and the latter refers to the difference between the upper and the lower confidence limits. These two key concepts are related: longer confidence intervals have higher coverage probabilities approaching the nominal level and shorter confidence intervals have lower coverage probabilities. In statistics, one is often faced with a number of confidence intervals for a parameter and a decision has to be made on the "best" one. Since these two key concepts are in opposition to each other i.e. better coverage probability goes with weaker length and vice versa, it is useful to have some practical way of combining these measures. In this paper, such an easy to compute measure is proposed and applied to two well-known problems as well as a practical example from the literature.

Suppose we have a sample, $\boldsymbol{x} = \{x_1, ..., x_n\}$, drawn from an unknown distribution function, F. Let $\ell(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x}) = (\ell_L(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x}), \ell_U(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x}))$ be the α-level confidence interval for the unknown parameter θ. Also, denote by $L(\alpha)$, the average of the confidence interval length between the upper confidence limit $\ell_U(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x})$ and the lower confidence limit, $\ell_L(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x})$. Furthermore, let the coverage probability be given by $\eta(\alpha) = P(\theta \in \ell(\alpha; \boldsymbol{x}))$.

The estimation of $\eta(\alpha)$ is an important issue for statisticians and the goal is to obtain a confidence interval estimator with estimated coverage probability (usually referred to as empirical coverage probability), $\hat{\eta}(\alpha)$, equal to the nominal coverage, $1 - \alpha$. However, it is often the case that $\hat{\eta}(\alpha)$ is not exactly equal to $1 - \alpha$. A requirement for a good confidence interval (e.g. normal theory or bootstrap intervals) is to have a short interval length and a coverage probability equal to or approximately equal to the nominal coverage. As a result, confidence interval estimator selection can be done by a comparison of the intervals' coverage probabilities and lengths. However, this can be subjective especially if several interval estimators are involved and a compromise is sought between coverage probability and interval length.

A handful of methods to overcome the difficulties in comparing confidence interval estimators rely on an adjustment of the interval lengths such that each interval gives a coverage probability close or equal to the nominal level, $1-\alpha$. In that case, the comparison of the confidence interval estimators can be done using the confidence interval lengths only. Examples of these methods in the literature include bootstrap calibration (Loh, 1987; Martin, 1990) and prepivoting (Beran, 1987; Lee and Young, 2003). The basic idea underlying the bootstrap calibration is to obtain β ($\beta < \alpha$) such that the resultant interval's coverage probability equals $1-\alpha$ i.e. $\eta(\beta) = 1-\alpha$. Also, prepivoting involves the transformation of the confidence set root by its bootstrap cumulative distribution function. This has an important application in reducing the coverage error of bootstrap confidence sets.

However, in practice, these bootstrap based procedures generally require computationally costly nested resamples of at least two levels from the data. The coverage precision increases with increasing levels of resamples and can be done until a point where the comparison can be done on the interval length only. We remark that Loh (1987) and Loh (1988) proposed a linear and a nonlinear interpolation respectively to reduce the level of bootstrap replications with varying degrees of success. Nevertheless, this limits the practical application of these methods and a determination is needed of the benefits of higher levels of resamples against the computational cost.

In this paper, we propose an index which offers a straight forward approach of comparing confidence interval estimators without the use of Monte Carlo simulation or analytical derivations. The index is based on a compromise between the coverage probability and the confidence interval length.

The need for such an index arose from a recent very large simulation study of comparing different estimators in extreme value theory. Running the simulation to obtain a variety of confidence intervals based on the different estimators, was already computationally very intensive. Applying a further computationally intensive calibration, would have been computationally too costly. Hence the proposed index was developed as a computationally inexpensive compromise between coverage probability and confidence interval length.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the bootstrap calibration method is presented. The proposed confidence interval index is presented in Section 3. In

Section 4, we conduct a simulation study to assess the finite sample performance of the proposed index on four popular confidence interval estimators of the mean of a normal distribution. In addition, several confidence interval estimators of the binomial proportion are examined using the index. Section 5 deals with an application of the index on a study of the performance of several confidence interval estimators of the coefficient of variation from Gulhar et al. (2012). Finally, we present some concluding remarks in Section 6.

2 BOOTSTRAP CALIBRATION

Loh (1991) catalogs some procedures for generating confidence intervals with improved coverage probabilities. These include Edgeworth expansion (analytical) and bootstrapping (simulation). The author states, with references, that given that the Edgeworth expansion and bootstrap procedures are valid, both produce results that have the same asymptotic error rates. In particular, the bootstrap procedure implements the Edgeworth correction through simulation in an automatic fashion. In view of this, we consider the bootstrap calibration method of Loh (1987).

Let $x_1, \ldots, x_n$ be a random sample of size n from the distribution function F. We consider the estimation of the $100(1-\alpha)\%$ two-sided normal-theory confidence interval of the mean, $\theta = \theta(F)$, given by

$$[\theta_L,\ \theta_U] = \left[\hat{\theta} + \frac{z_{\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}},\ \hat{\theta} - \frac{z_{\alpha/2}\hat{\sigma}}{\sqrt{n}}\right]. \tag{1}$$

Here, $\hat{\sigma}$ and $z_{\alpha/2} = \Phi^{-1}(\alpha/2)$ are the unbiased estimate of the variance and the quantile of the standard normal distribution, Φ, respectively.

If F is normally distributed and n large, the estimated coverage probability, $\hat{\eta}(\alpha)$, will be close to $1-\alpha$. However, for smaller n and non normal distributions, $\hat{\eta}(\alpha)$ may differ substantially from $1-\alpha$. The idea of calibration introduced by Loh (1987) is to replace α with β such that $\hat{\eta}(\beta)$ is close to $1-\alpha$. The calibration idea involves nested bootstrap samples in search of an appropriate value of β. However, Loh (1987) and Loh (1988) proposed a linear and a smooth non-linear interpolation respectively to reduce the number low for the seemingly infinite search for β to be replaced with one level of bootstrap

sampling. Thus, the calibration is obtained by generating B bootstrap replications.

Let $\boldsymbol{x}^* = \{x_1^*, \ldots, x_n^*\}$ be the a bootstrap sample from $\boldsymbol{x}$. Also, let $\hat{\theta}^* = \hat{\theta}(\boldsymbol{x}^*)$, $\hat{\sigma}^* = \hat{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{x}^*)$ and $t_j^* = \sqrt{n}\left(\hat{\theta}_i^* - \hat{\theta}\right)/\hat{\sigma}^*$ the t statistic computed from the $j th$ bootstrap sample. Loh (1991) defines $\hat{\lambda}_j = 1 - \Phi\left(|t_j^*|\right)$ and β is taken as the α-quantile of $\left(\hat{\lambda}_1, \ldots, \hat{\lambda}_B\right)$. In addition, the author argues that the calibration method above is equivalent to the bootstrap root method of Beran (1987).

3 THE INDEX

We introduce an index which offers a straight forward approach and avoids the computational burden in the bootstrap based methods in comparing confidence interval estimators. In addition, the index abstracts the information provided by the confidence interval length and coverage probability, thereby making it a standalone value for comparative purposes. The idea behind the proposed index was to obtain a value that is simple, easy to interpret and within the neighborhood of the desired coverage probability.

Consider R confidence interval estimators and let $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \{\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_R\}'$ and $\boldsymbol{L} = \{L_1, \ldots, L_R\}'$ denote the vectors of realized coverage probabilities and average interval lengths respectively.

The confidence interval index, I, is defined as

$$I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha) = k\left(1 - \frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{1 + H(\eta_j; \alpha)}{1 + \left(\frac{\eta_j}{1+L_j}\right)}\right)\right), \quad L \geq 0,\ 0 \leq \eta \leq 1,\ j = 1, \ldots, R, \tag{2}$$

where k is a constant depending on the significance level, α. Here, H is a loss function which describes the penalty incurred by the deviation of the empirical coverage probability from $1 - \alpha$. We remark that, several loss functions can be chosen for this purpose e.g. absolute, quadratic, a Huber function (Huber, 1992), among others. In this study, we choose H as a simple absolute loss function defined by

$$H(\eta_j; \alpha) = |1 - \alpha - \eta_j|,\ 0 \leq \eta \leq 1,\ j = 1 \ldots, R. \tag{3}$$

The rationale behind using (3) is that, together with an appropriate choice of k, we obtain a range of values of I in the neighbourhood of the desired coverage probability. Consequently, using (3), the scaling parameter k is taken as $(4-2\alpha)/(3-2\alpha)$ to obtain the range of values of I within the neighbourhood of the desired coverage probability. To derive the range of values of the index, I, we examine the limit at four extreme cases:

I. $L_j \to 0, \eta_j \to 0 \implies I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha) \to \frac{k\alpha}{2}$.

II. $L_j \to \infty, \eta_j \to 0 \implies I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha) \to \frac{k\alpha}{2}$.

III. $L_j \to \infty, \eta_j \to 1-\alpha \implies I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha) \to \frac{k}{2}$.

IV. $L_j \to 0, \eta_j \to 1-\alpha \implies I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha) \to 1$.

Therefore, $I(L_j, \eta_j; \alpha)$ has a range $[k\alpha/2,\ 1]$. A bad confidence interval estimator (i.e. an interval with low coverage probability and large interval length) corresponds to cases **I** and **II**, with an index value $I(L, \eta; \alpha) \to k\alpha/2$. On the other hand, a good confidence interval estimator (i.e. case **IV**) has $I(L, \eta; \alpha) \to 1$. In the subsequent sections, we take $\alpha = 0.05$ and, thus, $I(L_j, \eta_j) \in [0.034, 1.000], \quad j = 1, \ldots, R$.

4 SIMULATION STUDY

In this section, we study the performance of the confidence interval index, I, through a simulation study. In this regard, we assess the performance of several confidence interval estimators of the mean of a normal distribution and the binomial proportion using I.

4.1 Confidence Interval Index for the Mean

To study the behaviour of the estimators, we consider samples of size, n ($n = 10, 50, 100, 500, 1000$) from a normal distribution with mean, μ, and variance, σ^2. The parameter of interest is the population mean, μ, which is estimated by the sample mean, $\bar{x}$. The 95% two-sided confidence interval of μ is constructed using the normal theory interval and the Johnson t interval (unlike the normal theory interval, the Johnson t interval adjusts for positive and negative skewness in a data set by shifting the endpoints right and left respectively)

(Johnson, 1978). In addition, other confidence interval estimators considered are the bootstrap based intervals i.e. the bootstrap percentile and the Bias-Corrected and accelerated (BCa) (see e.g. Efron and Tibshirani, 1993, Chapters 12 and 14).

The following procedure is used to compute the index and its summary statistics:

A1. Generate $N(N = 1000)$ samples each of size n from $N(\mu, \sigma^2)$.

A2. Draw $B(B = 1000)$ bootstrap samples from each sample in A4.1 and use these to compute B bootstrap confidence intervals (i.e. bootstrap percentile and the BCa) of the mean. Compute the average of the B interval lengths, L, and the empirical coverage probability $\hat{\eta}$ for both bootstrap interval types separately.

A3. Compute the confidence interval for the mean using the normal theory interval and Johnson t interval using each of the N samples in A4.1. Calculate the average of the N interval lengths, L, and the empirical coverage probability $\hat{\eta}$ for the two interval types.

A4. Repeat A1-A3 a large number of times $R(R = 5000)$, to obtain the pairs $\{(\hat{\eta}_1, L_1), \ldots, (\hat{\eta}_R, L_R)\}$ and, hence, the confidence interval index, $I^{(i,j)},\ i = 1, \ldots, 4,\ j = 1, \ldots, R$.

A5. Compute summary statistics for the indexes, $I^{(i,.)}\ i = 1, \ldots, 4$.

Table 1 shows the summary statistics of the index for the four interval types computed for observations from $N(2, 1)$. Similarly, Tables A.1 and A.2 in Appendix A show the corresponding results for $N(2, 4)$ and $N(2, 9)$ respectively. It can be seen that, as the sample size increases, I tends to 1: the confidence interval estimators improve with increasing sample size. This is expected in line with the weak law of large numbers: $\bar{x}$ approaches μ as $n \to \infty$.

In addition, for smaller sample sizes (i.e. $n \leq 50$), the Johnson t interval has the largest I values in most cases followed by the normal interval. Generally, these two estimators provide better confidence intervals as they have larger index values for measures of location, smaller variability, large negative skewness and large peakedness. In the case of large sample sizes (i.e. $n > 50$), there is not much difference between the performance of the normal theory and Johnson t interval estimators of the mean. The bootstrap percentile is the

Table 1: Summary statistics for the Confidence Interval Index of the Mean

		I			
n	Basic Statistics	Normal Theory	Johnson t	Bootstrap Percentile	BCa
	Mean	0.8555	0.8600	0.8443	0.8401
10	Skewness	-0.4151	-2.0374	-0.2722	-0.3029
	Kurtosis	0.5392	8.1841	0.1896	0.3133
	St. dev	0.0075	0.0033	0.0084	0.0089
	Mean	0.8895	0.8913	0.8816	0.8793
50	Skewness	-0.4417	-1.4934	-0.0191	-0.2255
	Kurtosis	-0.3837	2.5216	-0.0874	-0.0693
	St. dev	0.0061	0.0031	0.0069	0.0074
	Mean	0.9229	0.9231	0.9179	0.9158
100	Skewness	-1.1576	-1.5628	-0.4305	-0.2758
	Kurtosis	0.9175	2.7156	-0.1391	-0.3270
	St. dev	0.0042	0.0029	0.0062	0.0064
	Mean	0.9708	0.9709	0.9693	0.9691
500	Skewness	-1.6225	-1.7231	-0.7722	-0.8726
	Kurtosis	2.7522	3.2814	-0.2012	0.1894
	St. dev	0.0021	0.0020	0.0033	0.0033
	Mean	0.9777	0.9778	0.9745	0.9732
	Median	0.9786	0.9785	0.9750	0.9740
1000	Skewness	-2.1632	-2.2197	-1.0131	-0.7991
	Kurtosis	6.7939	7.2921	0.8867	0.4052
	St. dev	0.0029	0.0029	0.0048	0.0053

next best confidence interval estimator of the mean followed by the BCa interval estimator based on the summary statistics. Since the sample mean is an unbiased estimator of the population mean, the percentile interval is expected, as shown in the simulation study, to give better intervals in terms of coverage and interval lengths. Also, for larger values of σ, the corresponding confidence intervals for the mean are wider. This is reflected in the mean (and median) of I having a decreasing order in Tables 1, A.1 and A.2 as σ increases from 1 through to 3.

Furthermore, we consider the performance of I in relation to bootstrap calibration of Loh (1987) and Loh (1988). Again, the estimation of the mean of a normal distribution is considered. Here, we consider smaller sample sizes where the empirical coverage probability tends to be smaller than the nominal level, $1-\alpha$. In that case, calibration can be used to increase the empirical coverage probability to approximately equal $1-\alpha$. Our aim in this case is to assess the conclusions reached for calibrated intervals in relation to the index. The results of the simulation study for observations from $N(2,1)$ are presented in Table 2. In addition, the results for observations from $N(2,4)$ and $N(2,9)$ are presented in Tables B.1 and B.2 respectively in Appendix B.

For smaller sample sizes ($n \leq 20$), the Johnson t interval has empirical coverage probabilities close to the nominal level of 0.95. Calibration of such interval leads to overestimation of the coverage probability. Therefore, we fail to calibrate intervals with empirical coverage probability close to 0.95. The performance of the Johnson t confidence interval estimator is expected as it adjusts for the skewness in the data (in particular for small sample sizes where skewness is prevalent). However, this interval consistently has the largest interval length compared with the Normal theory, bootstrap percentile and BCa. The index values for the Johnson t interval are the largest, and thus, can be considered as the most appropriate confidence interval estimator of the mean.

As the sample size increases, the normal theory interval and the Johnson t interval estimators outperform the other intervals in terms of coverage probability. Also, the normal theory interval estimator has interval lengths fairly competitive to the bootstrap based intervals and outperforms the Johnson t interval. This can be seen from the index of the normal theory interval having the largest values.

Table 2: Calibtated and non-calibrated interval estimators for the mean

		Non-calibrated			Calibrated		
Sample size	Estimator	CP	L	I	CP	L	I
$n = 10$	Normal theory	0.907	1.196	0.849	0.922	1.290	0.852
	Johnson t	0.936	1.380	0.855	0.960	1.518	0.853
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.884	1.128	0.838	0.906	1.219	0.846
	BCa	0.889	1.146	0.840	0.906	1.235	0.845
$n = 15$	Normal theory	0.931	0.988	0.878	0.945	1.045	0.883
	Johnson t	0.950	1.081	0.883	0.950	1.081	0.883
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.918	0.953	0.873	0.929	1.004	0.876
	BCa	0.917	0.959	0.872	0.931	1.013	0.876
$n = 20$	Normal theory	0.930	0.866	0.887	0.942	0.890	0.893
	Johnson t	0.946	0.924	0.892	0.952	0.953	0.892
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.922	0.842	0.884	0.931	0.865	0.888
	BCa	0.919	0.847	0.882	0.929	0.870	0.886
$n = 30$	Normal theory	0.951	0.708	0.912	0.951	0.708	0.912
	Johnson t	0.962	0.739	0.907	0.962	0.739	0.907
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.950	0.695	0.914	0.950	0.695	0.914
	BCa	0.946	0.699	0.911	0.946	0.699	0.911
$n = 50$	Normal theory	0.950	0.550	0.928	0.950	0.550	0.928
	Johnson t	0.953	0.564	0.926	0.953	0.564	0.926
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.941	0.545	0.923	0.958	0.575	0.923
	BCa	0.945	0.545	0.926	0.954	0.572	0.925

In general, we note that calibration as demonstrated in Table 2 does not necessarily bring the empirical coverage up to the desired level of $1 - \alpha$. Thus, calibration, although expensive, is not always attractive. We find that the conclusions of the confidence interval index for the non-calibrated intervals agree mostly with that of the calibrated intervals. Again, if the coverage probability is close to the nominal value, calibration leads to over-estimation of the coverage probability. However, the index penalizes such intervals for the deviation from the nominal level, and thus, discriminates good intervals from the bad ones.

4.2 The Confidence Interval Index for the Binomial Proportion

In this section, we consider the estimation of the binomial proportion by sampling from a binomial distribution. This issue usually arises in applied statistics e.g. incidence rates (in medical science), proportion of defective items (in manufacturing), among others. In addition, unlike the confidence interval for the mean, that of the proportion enables us to measure the performance of the index on non-symmetric intervals.

Assume X is binomially distributed with parameters n and p, written, $X \sim Bin(n, p)$. Here, the estimator, $\hat{p}$, is the maximum likelihood estimator given by $\hat{p} = X/n$. This estimator is consistent and, since, the expected value of X is equal np, it is also unbiased.

The most basic form of an interval estimate for the proportion, p, is the Wald interval,

$$\hat{p} \pm Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})/n} \tag{4}$$

(see e.g. Leemis and Trivedi, 1996; Brown et al., 2001, 2002). The properties of this interval estimator have been studied extensively in the literature. Its performance is known to be erratic with respect to coverage probability. In addition, recommendations concerning the values of n and p where this interval is appropriate are conflicting (see e.g. Leemis and Trivedi, 1996). Several attempts have been made to obtain better confidence interval estimators of the binomial proportion. For example, Agresti and Caffo (2000) proposed an amendment of the interval (4) by defining $\hat{p}$ as $(X + 2)/(n + 2)$. Some further modifications and other intervals that are not based on the normality assumption are presented in Table 3.

In the present study, we generate samples of size, n, and proportion, p, from a binomial distribution. Each estimator in Table 3 is used to obtain a confidence interval for p. We

Table 3: Confidence intervals for the binomial proportion

Estimator	Confidence Interval	Reference
Exact	$(\text{Beta}(\alpha/2; X, n-X+1),\ \text{Beta}(1-\alpha/2; X, n-X+1))$	Agresti and Caffo (2000)
Wald	$\hat{p} \pm Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{\hat{p}(1-\hat{p})/n}$	Brown et al. (2001)
Arcsin	$\sin^2\left(\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{X-1/2}{n}} \pm \frac{Z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n}}\right)$	Pires and Amado (2008)
Arcsin.CC	$\sin^2\left(\arcsin\sqrt{\frac{X-1/8}{n+3/4}} \pm \frac{Z_{\alpha/2}}{2\sqrt{n+1/2}}\right)$	Pires and Amado (2008)
Pois	$\left(\frac{1}{2n}\chi^2_{2X,1-\alpha/2},\ \frac{1}{2n}\chi^2_{2(X+1),1-\alpha/2}\right)$	Leemis and Trivedi (1996)
BCG	$\frac{X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}/2}{n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}} \pm Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{\frac{X}{n^2}\left(1-\frac{X}{n}\right)}$	Brown et al. (2002)
Wils	$\frac{X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}/2}{n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}} \pm \sqrt{\frac{nZ^2_{\alpha/2}}{\left(n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}\right)^2}\left(\frac{X}{n}\left(1-\frac{X}{n}\right)+\frac{Z^2_{\alpha/2}}{4n}\right)}$	Wilson (1927)
Wils.CC	$\left(\frac{2X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}-1-Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{Z^2_{\alpha/2}-2-1/n+4X(1-X/n+1/n)}}{2\left(n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}\right)},\ \frac{2X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}+1+Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{Z^2_{\alpha/2}+2-1/n+4X(1-X/n-1/n)}}{2\left(n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}\right)}\right)$	Wilson (1927)
AgreC	$\frac{X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}/2}{n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}} \pm Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{\frac{X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}/2}{\left(n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}\right)^2}\left(1-\frac{X+Z^2_{\alpha/2}/2}{n+Z^2_{\alpha/2}}\right)}$	Agresti and Coull (1998)
Ag.add4	$\frac{X+2}{n+4} \pm Z_{\alpha/2}\sqrt{\frac{X+2}{(n+4)^2}\left(1-\frac{X+2}{n+4}\right)}$	Agresti and Caffo (2000)
mid-P	$(\text{Beta}(\alpha/2; X+1/2, n-X+1/2), \text{Beta}(1-\alpha/2; X+1/2, n-X+1/2))$	Agresti and Caffo (2000)

repeat the process R ($R = 1000$) times and obtain the average confidence interval length and coverage probability. We then compute diagnostic checks on these intervals using the index I in (2).

Tables 4-6 show the results of the simulation for combinations of n and p.

We find that the confidence interval length improves with increasing sample size. In addition, most of the empirical coverage probabilities of the estimators become much closer to the nominal level of 0.95 as the sample size increases. In particular, the Pois estimator for estimating $p = 0.1$, improves drastically from $\hat{\eta} = 0.5560$ to $\hat{\eta} = 0.942$ respectively for sample sizes 10 and 100. Together with the corresponding confidence interval lengths, the values of index for the Pois estimator increases from 0.6940 (compared with the best estimator's index of 0.9395) to 0.9715 (joint best with Arc.CC) for sample sizes 10 and 100 respectively. However, for other values of p (more generally $p > 0.1$), the Pois estimator overestimates the coverage probability and has larger confidence intervals relative to the other estimators. Therefore, the Pois estimator has smaller index values compared with the other estimators, and hence, is not appropriate for the estimation of p.

Furthermore, the Exact estimator overestimates the coverage probability in all cases. In addition, it has large confidence interval lengths and these are shown in its index values.

Table 4: Confidence interval index for the binomial proportion using $n = 10$

	(a) $p = 0.1$			(b) $p = 0.5$			(c) $p = 0.9$		
Estimator	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
Exact	0.9776	0.4859	0.9281	0.9810	0.6012	0.9149	0.9784	0.4832	0.9282
Wald	0.6250	0.2701	0.7477	0.8990	0.5877	0.8936	0.6490	0.2781	0.7646
Arc	0.6110	0.2531	0.7396	0.8990	0.5508	0.8975	0.6350	0.2606	0.7568
Arc.CC	0.9776	0.4757	0.9292	0.9810	0.6286	0.9122	0.9784	0.4721	0.9294
Pois	0.5560	0.2630	0.6940	0.9880	0.7937	0.8948	1.0000	1.0964	0.8668
Wils	0.9310	0.3661	0.9373	0.9810	0.5076	0.9248	0.9380	0.3682	0.9411
Wils.CC	0.9860	0.4338	0.9321	0.9810	0.5777	0.9174	0.9860	0.4359	0.9318
BCG	0.6110	0.2701	0.7369	0.9810	0.5877	0.9163	0.6350	0.2781	0.7541
AgreC	0.9310	0.4015	0.9331	0.9810	0.5131	0.9242	0.9380	0.4036	0.9369
Ag.add4	0.9310	0.4042	0.9328	0.9810	0.5106	0.9245	0.9380	0.4063	0.9366
midP	0.9860	0.3721	0.9395	0.9810	0.5517	0.9201	0.9860	0.3749	0.9391

Table 5: Confidence interval index for the binomial proportion using $n = 20$

	(a) $p = 0.1$			(b) $p = 0.5$			(c) $p = 0.9$		
Estimator	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
Exact	0.9853	0.3123	0.9472	0.9670	0.4462	0.9350	0.9864	0.3081	0.9475
Wald	0.8850	0.2398	0.9270	0.9670	0.4270	0.9372	0.8810	0.2340	0.9254
Arc	0.8730	0.2322	0.9210	0.9670	0.4135	0.9388	0.8690	0.2266	0.9194
Arc.CC	0.9853	0.3041	0.9483	0.9670	0.4582	0.9337	0.9864	0.2991	0.9487
Pois	0.8440	0.2313	0.9036	0.9940	0.5755	0.9144	1.0000	0.7888	0.8920
Wils	0.9580	0.2664	0.9589	0.9670	0.3928	0.9412	0.9550	0.2628	0.9600
Wils.CC	0.9870	0.2970	0.9489	0.9670	0.4343	0.9364	0.9880	0.3032	0.9478
BCG	0.8440	0.2398	0.9024	0.9670	0.4270	0.9372	0.8360	0.2340	0.8983
AgreC	0.9580	0.2883	0.9561	0.9670	0.3943	0.9410	0.9550	0.2852	0.9571
Ag.add4	0.9580	0.2897	0.9559	0.9670	0.3930	0.9412	0.9550	0.2867	0.9569
midP	0.9870	0.2662	0.9530	0.9670	0.4126	0.9389	0.9880	0.2618	0.9534

Table 6: Confidence interval index for the binomial proportion using $n = 100$

	(a) $p = 0.1$			(b) $p = 0.5$			(c) $p = 0.9$		
Estimator	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
Exact	0.9740	0.1798	0.9677	0.9670	0.2869	0.9544	0.9630	0.1812	0.9696
Wald	0.8820	0.1599	0.9369	0.9390	0.2745	0.9534	0.8560	0.1617	0.9213
Arc	0.9420	0.1579	0.9711	0.9390	0.2710	0.9539	0.9320	0.1596	0.9653
Arc.CC	0.9560	0.1774	0.9715	0.9670	0.2901	0.9540	0.9500	0.1787	0.9725
Pois	0.9420	0.1553	0.9715	0.9890	0.3732	0.9387	1.0000	0.5073	0.9204
Wils	0.9740	0.1655	0.9697	0.9390	0.2647	0.9547	0.9630	0.1669	0.9716
Wils.CC	0.9740	0.1838	0.9671	0.9670	0.2832	0.9549	0.9630	0.1852	0.9690
BCG	0.9420	0.1599	0.9708	0.9670	0.2745	0.9560	0.9320	0.1617	0.9650
AgreC	0.9740	0.1748	0.9684	0.9390	0.2648	0.9547	0.9630	0.1761	0.9703
Ag.add4	0.9740	0.1753	0.9683	0.9390	0.2645	0.9547	0.9630	0.1766	0.9703
midP	0.9420	0.1646	0.9701	0.9390	0.2702	0.9540	0.9320	0.1660	0.9644

This is consistent with results reported in Pires and Amado (2008). In most cases, estimators such as Wilson, AgreC, Ag.add4 and midP have relatively good coverage properties and interval lengths and are shown in their I values usually approaching 1.

In general, for the estimation of a proportion, the index is able to distinguish between estimators that are appropriate or not based on their interval lengths and coverage probabilities.

5 APPLICATION

To illustrate the application of our index, we consider the paper by Gulhar et al. (2012). The authors compared several confidence interval estimators for the coefficient of variation (CV). The coefficient of variation is defined as the variability of a random variable relative to its mean. It is usually expressed as a percentage. The confidence interval estimators of the CV were compared based on their interval lengths and the empirical coverage probabilities. The authors used separate plots for the coverage probabilities and the interval lengths

across different sample sizes, CV values and distributions. We take a different approach in this paper by constructing plots showing simultaneously the coverage probabilities and the confidence interval index, I.

Table 7: List of confidence interval estimators in Gulhar et al. (2012)

Abbreviation	Confidence Interval type
NP.BS	Bootstrap Percentile
PBS	Bootstrap-t
Mill	Interval from asymptotic normal approximation (Miller, 1991)
BSMill	Modified median Miller estimator based on critical values from bootstrap samples
BS C.P	Curto and Pinto's (2009) modified median estimator based on bootstrap sample
S.K	Sharma and Krishna's (1994) interval from inverted CV
C.P	Curto and Pinto's (2009) *iid* assumption interval
McK	Interval from chi-square approximation (McKay, 1932)
MMcK	Modified McKay's interval (Vangel, 2012)
Panich	Panichkitkosolkul's (2009) modified McKay's interval
Prop	Gulhar et al.'s (2012) interval from chi-square approximation
MedMill	Median Modified Miller Estimator
MedMcK	Median Modified of McKay interval
MedMMcK	Median Modification of Modified McKay's interval
Med C.P	Median Modified Curto and Pinto's (2009) interval

The various confidence intervals considered and their abbreviations are presented in Table 7. We compute the confidence interval indices for values in Table 4 (Gulhar et al., 2012, p. 63) and assess the conclusions reached in that paper with that of the computed confidence interval indices. The confidence interval indices for each combination of n and CV are shown in Tables C.1-C.4 in Appendix C. In addition, the plots of the coverage probabilities and the corresponding confidence interval index values are presented in Figure 1. We can now make inferences from the graphs and compare these with the conclusions reached in Gulhar et al. (2012).

Firstly, it can be seen that the most visible estimator that performs badly is the S.K estimator. It has mostly low coverage probability and this is reflected in it having smaller values on the index. It must be noted that some of the corresponding interval lengths



(a) $n = 15,\ CV = 0.1$ (b) $n = 15,\ CV = 0.3$ (c) $n = 15,\ CV = 0.5$



(d) $n = 25,\ CV = 0.1$ (e) $n = 25,\ CV = 0.3$ (f) $n = 25,\ CV = 0.5$



(g) $n = 50,\ CV = 0.1$ (h) $n = 50,\ CV = 0.3$ (i) $n = 50,\ CV = 0.5$



(j) $n = 100,\ CV = 0.1$ (k) $n = 100, CV = 0.3$ (l) $n = 100,\ CV = 0.5$

Figure 1: Line plot of coverage probability of estimators with confidence interval index superimposed. $\circ$: empirical coverage probability. $+$: I value. - - - : nominal coverage.

of the S.K estimator were 2 to 8 times shorter than the other interval lengths. However, having a shorter interval length with low coverage probability is not practically desirable. As the sample size increases, there is a remarkable increase in the performance of the S.K estimator especially for $p = 0.5$. Therefore, we can conclude that, in this case, the index discriminates the bad estimator from the good ones even though shorter interval lengths were recorded.

Secondly, Gulhar et al. (2012, p. 57) concludes that "By $n = 100$, almost all intervals are performing at a similar level (Figure 1). All C.P intervals (C.P, Med C.P, and BS C.P) over exceeded the expected coverage probability of 95% and reached 100% and are clear outliers". From Figure 1, it can easily be seen from the bottom panel (i.e. for $n = 100$) that the index values for these estimators are smaller compared to the other estimators: this indicates that the C.P-based estimators are inappropriate for the estimation of the CV relative to the other estimators.

Thirdly, we can plot the index against sample size and CV values as an alternative to the four cases: CP against sample size; CP against CV; Interval length against n; and interval length against CV. These graphs, not shown here, lead to the same conclusions obtained in Gulhar et al. (2012).

In general, the index values are consistent with the conclusions from the CP and the interval lengths. Therefore, the index provides a useful, but computationally inexpensive method for measuring the relative performance of the estimators of confidence intervals for CV.

6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, an index for measuring the performance of confidence interval estimators was proposed. The index is based on the traditional trade-off between confidence interval length and empirical coverage probability. Unlike the confidence interval length which has unbounded range, R+, the index ranges in a bounded interval. As an example, if $\alpha = 0.05$, the index can range over the interval (0.033,1). We showed that index values close to 1 indicate a good confidence interval estimator whereas values far removed from 1 indicate a bad confidence interval estimator. Thus, it can easily be superimposed on

a plot of coverage probabilities to aid in the selection of estimators with good coverage probabilities and interval lengths. The index can be used alone or to complement the coverage probability for measuring the performance of confidence interval estimators.

References

Agresti, A. and B. Caffo (2000). Simple and effective confidence intervals for proportions and differences of proportions result from adding two successes and two failure. *The American Statistician 54*(4), 280–288.

Agresti, A. and B. A. Coull (1998). Approximate is better than "exact" for interval estimation of binomial proportions. *The American Statistician 52*(2), 119–126.

Beran, R. (1987, sep). Prepivoting to reduce level error of confidence sets. *Biometrika 74*(3), 457–468.

Brown, L. D., T. T. Cai, and A. DasGupta (2001). Interval estimation for a binomial proportion. *Statistical Science 16*(2), 101–117.

Brown, L. D., T. T. Cai, and A. Dasgupta (2002). Confidence intervals for a binomial proportion and asymptotic expansions. *The Annals of Statistics 30*(1), 160–201.

Curto, J. D. and J. C. Pinto (2009, jan). The coefficient of variation asymptotic distribution in the case of non-iid random variables. *Journal of Applied Statistics 36*(1), 21–32.

Efron, B. and R. J. Tibshirani (1993). *An introduction to the bootstrap*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Gulhar, M., B. M. Golam Kibria, A. N. Albatineh, and N. U. Ahmed (2012). A comparison of some confidence intervals for estimating the population coefficient of variation: a simulation study. *SORT 36*(1), 45–68.

Huber, P. J. (1992). Robust estimation of a location parameter. In *Breakthroughs in statistics*, pp. 492–518. Springer.

Johnson, N. J. (1978). Modified t tests and confidence intervals for asymmetrical populations modified L tests and confidence intervals for asymmetrical populations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 73*(363), 536–544.

Lee, S. M. S. and G. A. Young (2003). Prepivoting by weighted bootstrap iteration. *Biometrika 90*, 393–410.

Leemis, L. and K. Trivedi (1996). A comparison of approximate interval estimators for the bernoulli parameter. *The American Statistician 50*(1), 1–20.

Loh, W.-Y. (1987). Calibrating confidence coefficients. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 82*(397), 155–162.

Loh, W.-Y. (1988, sep). Discussion: theoretical comparison of bootstrap confidence intervals. *The Annals of Statistics 16*(3), 972–976.

Loh, W.-Y. (1991). Bootstrap calibration for confidence interval construction and selection. *Statistica sinica 1*(2), 477–491.

Martin, M. (1990). On the double bootstrap. Technical report, (Report No. 347) Department of Statistics, Stanford University, California.

McKay, A. T. (1932, jan). Distribution of the coefficient of variation and the extended t distribution. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society 95*(4), 695–698.

Miller, G. E. (1991, jun). Asymptotic test statistics for coefficients of variation. *Communications in Statistics - Theory and Methods 20*(10), 3351–3363.

Panichkitkosolkul, W. (2009). Improved confidence intervals for a coefficient of variation of a normal distribution. *Thailand Statistician 7*(2), 193–199.

Pires, A. M. and C. Amado (2008). Interval estimators for a binomial proportion: comparison of twenty methods. *REVSTAT 6*(2), 165–197.

Sharma, K. and H. Krishna (1994). Asymptotic sampling distribution of inverse coefficient-of-variation and its applications. *IEEE Transactions on Reliability 43*(4), 630–633.

Vangel, M. G. (2012, feb). Confidence intervals for a normal coefficient of variation. *The American Statistician 15*(1), 21–26.

Wilson, E. B. (1927, jun). Probable inference, the law of succession, and statistical inference. *Journal of the American Statistical Association 22*(158), 209–212.

A Appendix A

Table A.1: Summary statistics for the confidence interval index of the mean of $N(2, 4)$

		I			
n	Basic Statistics	Normal Theory	Johnson t	Bootstrap Percentile	BCa
	Mean	0.7987	0.8033	0.7869	0.7830
10	Skewness	-0.0930	-0.9996	-0.2300	-0.2098
	Kurtosis	-0.1829	0.8588	-0.2278	0.02787
	St. dev	0.0077	0.0033	0.0088	0.0094
	Mean	0.8361	0.8367	0.8280	0.8250
50	Skewness	-0.5912	-1.4980	-0.0583	-0.0465
	Kurtosis	0.2151	3.6357	-0.0896	0.0194
	St. dev	0.0064	0.0034	0.0076	0.0078
	Mean	0.8762	0.8759	0.8710	0.8694
100	Skewness	-1.1804	-1.6440	-0.3224	-0.3335
	Kurtosis	1.3932	3.4384	-0.3708	-0.3132
	St. dev	0.0046	0.0034	0.0064	0.0071
	Mean	0.9033	0.9028	0.8979	0.8963
500	Skewness	-1.3682	-1.4446	-0.4986	-0.3773
	Kurtosis	1.8694	2.1344	-0.4946	-0.4205
	St. dev	0.0038	0.0031	0.0060	0.0064
	Mean	0.9241	0.9241	0.9200	0.9190
1000	Skewness	-1.6441	-1.7320	-0.7407	-0.4875
	Kurtosis	2.9252	3.6277	0.0939	-0.0241
	St. dev	0.0033	0.0029	0.0053	0.0056

Table A.2: Summary statistics for the confidence interval index of the mean of $N(2, 9)$

		I			
n	Basic Statistics	Normal Theory	Johnson t	Bootstrap Percentile	BCa
	Mean	0.7663	0.7724	0.7538	0.7497
10	Skewness	-0.1614	-1.0222	-0.0555	-0.3494
	Kurtosis	-0.3497	1.2167	0.0285	0.6608
	St. dev	0.0078	0.0034	0.0094	0.0089
	Mean	0.8440	0.8436	0.8381	0.8363
50	Skewness	-1.1309	-1.5119	-0.5116	-0.4061
	Kurtosis	1.1995	3.1921	-0.0450	0.0846
	St. dev	0.0047	0.0035	0.0069	0.0073
	Mean	0.8724	0.8722	0.8681	0.8666
100	Skewness	-1.3804	-1.4284	-0.7059	-0.4476
	Kurtosis	2.0343	2.6115	0.0604	-0.3759
	St. dev	0.0041	0.0034	0.0060	0.0069
	Mean	0.9272	0.9272	0.9232	0.9219
500	Skewness	-1.9225	-1.9466	-0.9264	-0.3603
	Kurtosis	4.8598	4.9394	0.4617	-0.6695
	St. dev	0.0032	0.0032	0.0054	0.0057
	Mean	0.9444	0.9444	0.9410	0.9400
1000	Skewness	-2.3456	-2.3415	-0.9406	-0.6297
	Kurtosis	8.2284	8.2325	0.6066	-0.2797
	St. dev	0.0033	0.0032	0.0052	0.0055

B Appendix B

Table B.1: Interval estimators for calibrated and non-calibrated interval for observations from $N(2, 4)$

		Non-calibrated			Calibrated		
Sample size	Estimator	CP	L	I	CP	L	I
$n = 10$	Normal Theory	0.908	2.390	0.792	0.933	2.646	0.800
	Johnson t	0.942	2.758	0.803	0.966	3.139	0.791
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.896	2.254	0.789	0.922	2.501	0.798
	BCa	0.888	2.290	0.783	0.920	2.531	0.795
$n = 15$	Normal Theory	0.932	1.991	0.823	0.942	2.109	0.825
	Johnson t	0.951*	2.179	0.827	0.951	2.179	0.827
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.922	1.921	0.819	0.937	2.017	0.825
	BCa	0.925	1.935	0.821	0.937	2.047	0.824
$n = 20$	Normal Theory	0.920	1.720	0.827	0.926	1.751	0.830
	Johnson t	0.942	1.837	0.836	0.947	1.874	0.838
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.906	1.675	0.820	0.914	1.706	0.824
	BCa	0.907	1.681	0.821	0.916	1.711	0.825
$n = 30$	Normal Theory	0.948*	1.425	0.860	0.954	1.425	0.860
	Johnson t	0.960*	1.487	0.855	0.963	1.487	0.855
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.947	1.401	0.861	0.951	1.422	0.862
	BCa	0.944	1.402	0.859	0.952	1.430	0.861
$n = 50$	Normal Theory	0.942	1.100	0.877	0.942	1.101	0.877
	Johnson t	0.952*	1.128	0.879	0.952	1.128	0.879
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.940	1.085	0.877	0.944	1.094	0.879
	BCa	0.939	1.090	0.876	0.940	1.090	0.876

Table B.2: Interval estimators for calibrated and non-calibrated interval for observations from $N(2, 9)$

		Non-calibrated			Calibrated		
Sample size	Estimator	CP	L	I	CP	L	I
$n = 10$	Normal Theory	0.918	3.593	0.766	0.949	4.149	0.776
	Johnson t	0.949*	4.147	0.777	0.949	4.147	0.777
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.898	3.396	0.757	0.938	3.903	0.774
	BCa	0.886	3.444	0.748	0.933	3.965	0.769
$n = 15$	Normal Theory	0.927	2.966	0.787	0.941	3.080	0.794
	Johnson t	0.950*	3.246	0.795	0.950	3.246	0.795
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.919	2.857	0.785	0.925	2.975	0.786
	BCa	0.919	2.883	0.784	0.926	2.994	0.786
$n = 20$	Normal Theory	0.925	2.573	0.797	0.942	2.741	0.803
	Johnson t	0.943	2.747	0.804	0.958	2.949	0.799
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.923	2.501	0.798	0.933	2.672	0.800
	BCa	0.921	2.516	0.797	0.935	2.678	0.801
$n = 30$	Normal Theory	0.950*	2.124	0.829	0.962	2.124	0.829
	Johnson t	0.957*	2.216	0.823	0.971	2.216	0.823
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.939	2.081	0.824	0.956	2.228	0.823
	BCa	0.943	2.088	0.826	0.959	2.249	0.821
$n = 50$	Normal Theory	0.947	1.650	0.848	0.949	1.673	0.848
	Johnson t	0.951*	1.691	0.847	0.959	1.716	0.843
	Bootstrap Percentile	0.946	1.626	0.849	0.947	1.667	0.850
	BCa	0.945	1.640	0.847	0.946	1.657	0.847

C Appendix C

Table C.1: Confidence interval index for $n = 15$

	(a) $CV = 0.1$			(b) $CV = 0.3$			(c) $CV = 0.5$		
	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
BSMill	0.9090	0.0736	0.9658	0.9075	0.2411	0.9399	0.9115	0.4631	0.9146
MedMill	0.9325	0.0759	0.9783	0.9295	0.2491	0.9514	0.9295	0.4788	0.9235
Mill	0.9235	0.0746	0.9736	0.9165	0.2437	0.9447	0.9180	0.4678	0.9179
MedMMcK	0.9445	0.0869	0.9831	0.9435	0.2989	0.9528	0.9540	0.7156	0.9110
MedMcK	0.9445	0.0871	0.9830	0.9390	0.3072	0.9492	0.9490	0.8401	0.9008
MMcK	0.9535	0.0854	0.9856	0.9505	0.2917	0.9573	0.9545	0.6890	0.9133
McK	0.9535	0.0857	0.9856	0.9465	0.3015	0.9542	0.9520	0.8265	0.9019
S.K	0.2120	0.0104	0.3789	0.5235	0.0978	0.6953	0.7265	0.2948	0.8178
C.P	0.9155	0.0721	0.9696	0.9120	0.2354	0.9433	0.9115	0.4519	0.9158
BS C.P	0.9025	0.0711	0.9626	0.9015	0.2329	0.9376	0.9060	0.4474	0.9131
Med C.P	0.9265	0.0733	0.9755	0.9245	0.2406	0.9497	0.9220	0.4626	0.9209
Prop	0.9520	0.0842	0.9861	0.9280	0.2534	0.9500	0.8915	0.4244	0.9071
Panich	0.9510	0.0824	0.9865	0.9525	0.2791	0.9585	0.9535	0.6405	0.9181
NP.BS	0.8395	0.0645	0.9273	0.8400	0.2122	0.9040	0.8650	0.4240	0.8910
PBS	0.8700	0.0645	0.9452	0.8630	0.2125	0.9178	0.8860	0.4239	0.9038

Table C.2: Confidence interval index for $n = 25$

	(a) $CV = 0.1$			(b) $CV = 0.3$			(c) $CV = 0.5$		
	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
BSMill	0.9250	0.0559	0.9774	0.9220	0.1827	0.9564	0.9145	0.3476	0.9300
MedMill	0.9345	0.0571	0.9824	0.9340	0.1867	0.9625	0.9300	0.3557	0.9380
Mill	0.9305	0.0565	0.9803	0.9290	0.1843	0.9601	0.9180	0.3503	0.9317
MedMMcK	0.9450	0.0617	0.9873	0.9445	0.2068	0.9656	0.9430	0.4304	0.9367
MedMcK	0.9450	0.0618	0.9873	0.9435	0.2094	0.9646	0.9360	0.4505	0.9304
MMcK	0.9500	0.0610	0.9901	0.9440	0.2039	0.9657	0.9515	0.4220	0.9414
McK	0.9495	0.0611	0.9898	0.9450	0.2070	0.9658	0.9460	0.4454	0.9368
S.K	0.2785	0.0101	0.4638	0.6775	0.0948	0.8163	0.8240	0.2812	0.8840
C.P	0.9640	0.0714	0.9859	0.9605	0.2331	0.9629	0.9530	0.4431	0.9386
BS C.P	0.9565	0.0707	0.9874	0.9620	0.2312	0.9628	0.9560	0.4397	0.9383
Med C.P	0.9675	0.0722	0.9852	0.9645	0.2362	0.9616	0.9585	0.4500	0.9366
Prop	0.9490	0.0603	0.9896	0.9235	0.1822	0.9573	0.8795	0.3043	0.9149
Panich	0.9520	0.0598	0.9899	0.9450	0.1989	0.9669	0.9500	0.4070	0.9434
NP.BS	0.8770	0.0513	0.9515	0.8745	0.1676	0.9313	0.8825	0.3234	0.9142
PBS	0.8950	0.0512	0.9617	0.8900	0.1675	0.9404	0.8920	0.3232	0.9199

Table C.3: Confidence interval index for $n = 50$

	(a) $CV = 0.1$			(b) $CV = 0.3$			(c) $CV = 0.5$		
	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
BSMill	0.9365	0.0395	0.9863	0.9365	0.1273	0.9726	0.9380	0.2450	0.9567
MedMill	0.9395	0.0400	0.9878	0.9445	0.1289	0.9767	0.9385	0.2478	0.9566
Mill	0.9365	0.0398	0.9863	0.9400	0.1281	0.9744	0.9340	0.2459	0.9544
MedMMcK	0.9475	0.0416	0.9918	0.9515	0.1355	0.9784	0.9450	0.2726	0.9570
MedMcK	0.9475	0.0416	0.9918	0.9520	0.1362	0.9782	0.9430	0.2771	0.9553
MMcK	0.9475	0.0413	0.9919	0.9520	0.1347	0.9785	0.9450	0.2703	0.9573
McK	0.9475	0.0414	0.9919	0.9525	0.1355	0.9782	0.9455	0.2755	0.9569
S.K	0.3740	0.0102	0.5714	0.8290	0.0929	0.9162	0.9535	0.2794	0.9582
C.P	0.9950	0.0719	0.9804	0.9940	0.2316	0.9564	0.9925	0.4445	0.9293
BS C.P	0.9945	0.0715	0.9806	0.9930	0.2301	0.9568	0.9920	0.4428	0.9296
Med C.P	0.9950	0.0723	0.9804	0.9955	0.2330	0.9559	0.9935	0.4478	0.9287
Prop	0.9455	0.0409	0.9909	0.9320	0.1222	0.9709	0.8855	0.2065	0.9320
Panich	0.9465	0.0409	0.9914	0.9495	0.1331	0.9788	0.9495	0.2662	0.9604
NP.BS	0.9080	0.0377	0.9711	0.9090	0.1220	0.9581	0.9080	0.2365	0.9408
PBS	0.9110	0.0377	0.9728	0.9145	0.1220	0.9612	0.9210	0.2368	0.9482

Table C.4: Confidence interval index for $n = 100$

	(a) $CV = 0.1$			(b) $CV = 0.3$			(c) $CV = 0.5$		
	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I	CP	CIL	I
BSMill	0.9530	0.0280	0.9948	0.9460	0.0907	0.9833	0.9385	0.1699	0.9674
MedMill	0.9560	0.0282	0.9943	0.9520	0.0912	0.9850	0.9485	0.1715	0.9727
Mill	0.9540	0.0281	0.9947	0.9495	0.0910	0.9851	0.9430	0.1709	0.9698
MedMMcK	0.9630	0.0287	0.9930	0.9480	0.0937	0.9839	0.9515	0.1813	0.9718
MedMcK	0.9630	0.0287	0.9930	0.9470	0.0939	0.9833	0.9520	0.1826	0.9716
MMcK	0.9610	0.0286	0.9934	0.9475	0.0934	0.9837	0.9505	0.1805	0.9721
McK	0.9610	0.0286	0.9934	0.9475	0.0937	0.9836	0.9510	0.1820	0.9718
S.K	0.5355	0.0102	0.7232	0.9510	0.0940	0.9848	0.9920	0.2724	0.9511
C.P	0.9995	0.0722	0.9796	1.0000	0.2337	0.9549	1.0000	0.4390	0.9283
BS C.P	1.0000	0.0719	0.9796	1.0000	0.2330	0.9550	1.0000	0.4365	0.9286
Med C.P	0.9995	0.0724	0.9796	1.0000	0.2344	0.9548	1.0000	0.4406	0.9281
Prop	0.9600	0.0283	0.9936	0.9280	0.0851	0.9744	0.8955	0.1416	0.9475
Panich	0.9615	0.0285	0.9933	0.9485	0.0928	0.9843	0.9525	0.1792	0.9719
NP.BS	0.9380	0.0271	0.9892	0.9350	0.0881	0.9778	0.9275	0.1667	0.9618
PBS	0.9405	0.0271	0.9905	0.9345	0.0883	0.9775	0.9315	0.1664	0.9641